# House Resolution 112 - Introduced

# HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 112

### BY WILLS

- 1 A Resolution regarding the Environmental Protection
- 2 Agency's definition of "waters of the United
- 3 States".
- 4 WHEREAS, the federal Clean Water Act and
- 5 implementing regulations of the past four decades
- 6 recognize the partnership between federal, state, and
- 7 local governments to achieve the objectives of the
- 8 Act; and
- 9 WHEREAS, section 101(g) of the Clean Water Act
- 10 expressly states that "the authority of each state to
- 11 allocate quantities of water within its jurisdiction
- 12 shall not be superseded, abrogated or otherwise
- 13 impaired by this Act"; and
- 14 WHEREAS, the United States Environmental Protection
- 15 Agency and United States Army Corps of Engineers have
- 16 proposed a rule to redefine "waters of the United
- 17 States" that could significantly increase the costs and
- 18 regulatory requirements for state and local governments
- 19 and ultimately the costs for state and local residents
- 20 and businesses; and
- 21 WHEREAS, the proposed rule provides almost unlimited
- 22 federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act, impairs
- 23 state authority and therefore contravenes congressional
- 24 intent, and is not consistent with three distinct
- 25 rulings by the Supreme Court regarding the limits of
- 26 federal jurisdiction; and
- 27 WHEREAS, the proposed rule will apply to all
- 28 programs of the Clean Water Act and therefore

#### H.R. 112

- 1 subject more activities to Clean Water Act permitting
- 2 requirements, National Environmental Policy Act
- 3 analyses, mitigation requirements, and citizen suits
- 4 challenging local actions based on the applicability
- 5 and interpretation of newfound authorities; and
- 6 WHEREAS, the proposing agencies' economic analysis
- 7 for this rule did not consider impacts for the full
- 8 range of Clean Water Act programs affected or the
- 9 economic impacts to small businesses, and the analysis
- 10 relied on outdated cost data; and
- 11 WHEREAS, the justification for the scope of the
- 12 proposed rule rests on a scientific analysis that is
- 13 still under review and the proposing agencies proceeded
- 14 with development of a proposed rule addressing issues
- 15 associated with the connectivity of waters prior to
- 16 being informed by the Science Advisory Board review and
- 17 the implications of its findings; and
- 18 WHEREAS, the proposed rule does not provide an
- 19 explanation or clear understanding about how the
- 20 proposed expansion of Clean Water Act jurisdiction and
- 21 transfer of ultimate authority might affect other Clean
- 22 Water Act programs, state laws and responsibilities,
- 23 water rights, land use, governances, and regulated
- 24 parties; and
- 25 WHEREAS, the Environmental Protection Agency and the
- 26 Army Corps of Engineers have not fully consulted the
- 27 states and have undermined the cooperative federalism
- 28 asserted in the Clean Water Act; NOW THEREFORE,
- 29 BE IT RESOLVED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, That
- 30 the House of Representatives urges the Environmental

### H.R. 112

- 1 Protection Agency and the Army Corps of Engineers to
- 2 fully consult and engage states in any process that
- 3 may affect the management of their waters and to defer
- 4 redefining "waters of the United States" until the
- 5 Science Advisory Board concludes its review and the
- 6 Environmental Protection Agency and the Army Corps of
- 7 Engineers incorporate the conclusions of such review,
- 8 an economic analysis is completed that fully identifies
- 9 impacts of the proposal and any revised proposal on
- 10 economic development, and the redefinition provides
- 11 clarity on definitions and federal jurisdiction
- 12 consistent with previous Supreme Court rulings to
- 13 affirm that there is a limit to federal jurisdiction
- 14 under the Clean Water Act.